

Online Teaching II Course

Summary Report

Summer, 2011

Co-authors: Jane Peller and Angela Velez-Solic

Summary: The chairs from each of the colleges submitted applications for 17 faculty members to participate in the Summer II Online Teaching Course. Of those, twelve faculty members were chosen by the Deans to participate in the 2011 course. The applicants were evaluated on their desire for learning online teaching, their successful participation in the first online course, and their motivation for participation in future peer mentoring. The twelve participants were evenly spread throughout the University departments and were all tenure-track except for one instructor. The following is a list of the participants:

Vicki Byard, English
Jen Banas, HPERA
Denise Cloonan Cortez, World Languages & Cultures
Reza Dorestani, Accounting, Business Law & Finance
Edward Kasule, Political Science
Paul Lempke, Art
Jian Li, Management and Marketing
Alberto Lopez, Teacher Education
Terry Stirling, Ed. Leadership
Cris Toffolo, Justice Studies
Mickie Wong Lo, Special Education
Chunwei Xian, Accounting
Jane Peller, Social Work

The University's goal is to increase online course offerings as stated in the University strategic plan and to support hybrid education throughout the departments. To reach that goal, CTL supported the creation of a course to train faculty in online course design for courses to be taught within the next academic year and to position those faculty to mentor future faculty online. At the completion of the course, one participant is teaching their online course in the fall, 2011 as well as one of the facilitators who also developed an online course during the summer. Five participants will be deploying their course in the spring 2012 term and three other courses will be offered in the summer term of 2012. Four participants are still undecided about when their course will be offered.

Course Structure: The Online Teaching II course was developed by Angela Velez-Solic and Jane Peller. This partnership provided a balance of faculty representation and expert CTL instructional design skills. The course met every Tuesday and Wednesday for 3 hours. Participants were required to attend one session per week. Each week had an agenda of both skill development in technology and instructional design. A Blackboard course was created and all materials were posted online. Each participant was placed as an instructor in the blackboard course and was able to upload content, participate in their own discussion forum, and monitor their own progress in the grade center.

Online Teaching II Course

Participants were paired for support learning during the experience. Partners were not necessarily from similar disciplines. The partners helped each other at different points during the course by going through their course content, structure, etc.

Profile Pre-course

A pre-survey was administered. Ten out of the twelve participants completed the survey. Fifty (50%) percent of participants had experience teaching an online teaching and 60% had also taught in a hybrid environment. However only 40% had ever designed an online course and 60% had experience designing hybrid learning (see Comparative Chart: #1 and #2). In the open-ended questions, overall participants expressed the desire to learn how to design online learning, and gain skills in use of technology to support online development. Generally they were not sure what either of those components entailed.

Findings:

1. In reference to item #3 in the comparative chart below: Participants were asked about their level of comfort in navigating in our LMS (Blackboard system). Prior to the course 30% rated themselves in the highest category and 70% rated themselves in the second highest category. This totaled to 100% within the top two categories. This is excellent.

But what is more impressive is that in the post course survey, participants rated themselves 91.6% in the highest category and 8.3% in the second highest. In other words the scores reversed. We attribute this change to parts of the course sessions were participants shared various LMS 'tricks' and 'shortcuts'.

2. In reference to item #4 in the comparative chart below: One of the most significant findings was in participants self perception of using instructional design principles. Pre course 20% participants rated themselves in the top category of strong understanding of instructional design principles, 40 % in the second highest, 20% in the third, and 20 % below categories.

The post-evaluation indicated a significant increase in participant self-assessment. 75% of the participants reported being within the highest category of 'strong understanding of instructional design principles for online learning', and 25% in the second category. No one rated themselves below those rankings. We attribute this result to the course design of focusing on instructional design principles in each session. (See chart item #4).

3. In reference to item #5 in the comparative chart below: You will note a significant increase in participant's confidence to mentor other faculty in designing a online course. Considering that this was one of the course objectives, we are pleased that a majority (91%) of the participants could be called upon to help further online course development.

Online Teaching II Course

4. In reference to item #6 in the comparative chart below: related to the previous item, a majority of the participants (91%) feel comfortable mentoring faculty in their online courses as compared to 60% prior to completing the Online Teaching II course.
5. In reference to item #7 in the comparative chart below: Most impressive is that after completion of the Online Teaching II course, 100% of the participants ranked themselves in the top two categories in confidence in designing an online course.
6. In reference to item #8 in the comparative chart below: Most impressive is that after completion of the Online Teaching II course, 100% of the participants ranked themselves in the top two categories in confidence in teaching an online course.
7. In reference to feedback on quality of course design of the Online Teaching II course: 100% of participant chose rankings of good or excellent.
8. In reference to how the course changed them personally, professionally academically: In summary most of the narrative responses reflected that learning through collaboration, learning through 'doing' and developing technology software skills were most significant.

Comparative Chart

Item: survey question	Ratings	Pre-course %	Post-course %
#1. Have you taught online before:	Yes	50	n/a
	No	50	
#2. Have you designed a fully online course?	Yes	40	n/a
	No	60	
#3: Please rate your agreement. I am comfortable navigating the Learning Management System	Strongly agree	30	91.6
	Agree	70	8.3
#4. I have a strong understanding of instructional design principles for online learning	Strongly agree	20	75
	Agree	40	25
	Neither	20	0
	Disagree	10	0
	Strongly Disagree	10	0
#5. I am comfortable mentoring faculty at my University who want to design a course online	Strongly agree	20	66.6
	Agree	40	25
	Neither	20	8.3
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	20	0
#6. I am comfortable mentoring faculty who want to teach an online course	Strongly agree	20	67
	Agree	40	25
	Neither	20	8
	Disagree	10	0
	Strongly Disagree	10	0
#7. I am confident in my ability to design a quality	Strongly agree	30	75

Online Teaching II Course

online course	Agree	30	25
	Neither	30	0
	Disagree	10	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
#8. I am confident in my ability to effectively teach an online course	Strongly agree	20	75
	Agree	70	25
	Neither	10	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0

Implications:

Using the WIP model of course approval and evaluation, we implemented a process of evaluating the completion of the courses developed during and after the online course using a scale adapted from Quality Matters and Illinois Online Network (ION), which is called the Quality Standards for Online Courses Checklist. Jane and Angela reviewed each course online separately using the rubric. They then met and shared their findings and provided each instructor with one rubric that contained feedback. The checklist is attached to this report.

Future changes:

Based upon the survey feedback, informal conversations with participants, and debriefings from staff, we have concluded the following for goals for creating online courses:

- Develop and promote a departmental peer review process and mentoring process.
- Create and promote a campus-wide protocol for online course development and online course approval process.
 - Use the Quality Standards for Online Courses Checklist
 - Create an ongoing training program for course development
 - Create an ongoing training for peer mentoring as well as a support structure for it
- Provide appropriate and sufficient software products for the course participants
- Define and solidify the process for using the online course fee money strategically to benefit faculty, students, and the momentum of online course creation and delivery